



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,472	09/21/2004	Peter Hanping Chen	13321-US-PA	5471
31561	7590	08/09/2007		EXAMINER
JIANQ CHYUN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OFFICE 7 FLOOR-1, NO. 100 ROOSEVELT ROAD, SECTION 2 TAIPEI, 100 TAIWAN				FREJD, RUSSELL WARREN
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2128
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/09/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USA@JCIPGROUP.COM.TW

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/711,472	CHEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Russell Frejd	2128	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 September 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2 and 10-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 3-9 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some *
 - c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

In re Application of: Chen et al.

Examination of Application #10/711,472

1. Claims 1-23 of application 10/711,472, filed on 21-September-2004, are presented for examination.

Specification Objections

2. The disclosure is objected to because the phrase "which are well designed layout", on [p. 1, para. 5, line 6], appears to be grammatically incorrect.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph

3. Claims 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The following is a list of the specific rejections:

In claims 10-14, [line 1], the phrase "paths in IP component" is vague.

In claim 15, [line 3], the phrase "plurality of following instructions" is vague.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefore, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

- 4.1 Claims 15-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The invention claims "a computer-readable media for storing a program implemented by a computer system."

In re Application of: Chen et al.

4.2 This claimed subject matter lacks a practical application of a judicial exception (law of nature, abstract idea, naturally occurring article/phenomenon) since it fails to: 1) physically transform or reduce an article to a different state or thing; or 2) having the **final result** (not the steps) achieve or produce a: useful (specific, substantial, AND credible utility), concrete (assured, substantially repeatable/non-unpredictable), and tangible (real world/non-abstract, enabling usefulness to be realized) result. The Courts have found that subject matter that is not a practical application or use of an idea, a law of nature or a natural phenomenon is not patentable. As the Supreme Court has made clear, " [a]n idea of itself is not patentable," *Rubber-Tip Pencil Co. v. Howard*, 20 U.S. (1 Wall.) 498, 507 (1874); taking several abstract ideas and manipulating them together adds nothing to the basic equation. In re Warmerdam, 31 USPQ2d 1754 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Specifically, the claimed subject matter does not produce a tangible result because the claimed subject matter fails to produce a result that is limited to having real world value rather than a result that may be interpreted to be abstract in nature as, for example, a thought, a computation, or manipulated data. More specifically, the claimed subject matter provides for generating an IP characteristic library based on the simulation results. This produced result remains in the abstract and, thus, fails to achieve the required status of having real world value, because the claim recites a computer readable recording media for storing a program comprising a plurality of instructions. The media holding instructions is determined to recite data embodied on the computer readable medium. However, the data does not impart functionality to either the data as claimed or to the computer. As such, the claimed invention recites non-functional descriptive material, i.e., mere data. Non-functional descriptive material is merely carried on the medium, it is not structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium, and thereby does not manipulate, or execute, appropriate subject matter, and thus cannot constitute a statutory process (MPEP Section 2106).

In re Application of: Chen et al.

For an additional explanation, see the following:

**>Descriptive material can be characterized as either “functional descriptive material” or “nonfunctional descriptive material.” In this context, “functional descriptive material” consists of data structures and computer programs which impart functionality when employed as a computer component. (The definition of “data structure” is “a physical or logical relationship among data elements, designed to support specific data manipulation functions.” The New IEEE Standard Dictionary of Electrical and Electronics Terms 308 (5th ed. 1993).) ‘Nonfunctional descriptive material’ includes but is not limited to music, literary works, and a compilation or mere arrangement of data.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5.1 Claims 1, 2, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the article authored by Zarrineh et al., hereinafter Zarrineh, entitled *System-on-Chip Testability Using LSSD Scan Structures*.

5.2 Zarrineh discloses:

Claims 1 and 15: providing an IP component [p. 83, col. 2, see macroblock]; automatically generating a plurality of test patterns for all paths in the IP component [p. 85, col. 1, par. 1]; sequentially inputting the test patterns into the IP component for simulation, and outputting a

In re Application of: Chen et al.

plurality of corresponding simulation results [p. 85, col. 2, par. 2]; and generating an IP characteristic library based on the simulation results [p. 87, col. 1, par. 2, see reuse].

Claims 2 and 16: automatically searching all of the paths in the IP component; and generating the corresponding test patterns for each of the paths [p. 85, col. 1, par. 1].

Claim Objections

6. Claims 3-9 and 17-23 are objected to as being dependent upon a 102(b) rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, pending resolution of any additional rejections noted above.

Allowed Claims

7. Claims 10-14 are deemed allowable over the prior art at this time, pending resolution of any rejections noted above, because the prior art does not specifically disclose the claimed method of finding paths in an IP component.

Response Guidelines

8. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire **3 (three) months and 0 (zero) days** from the date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned (see MPEP 710.02, 710.02(b)).

8.1 Any response to the Examiner in regard to this non-final action should be

directed to: Russell Frejd, telephone number (571) 272-3779, Monday-Friday from 0530 to 1400 ET, or the examiner's supervisor, Kamini Shah, telephone number (571) 272-2279. Inquires of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC2100 Group Receptionist (571) 272-2100.

In re Application of: Chen et al.

mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to: (571) 273-8300

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to the Customer Service Window, Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA, 22314.

Date: 23-June-2007

RUSSELL FREJD

RUSSELL FREJD
PRIMARY EXAMINER